UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,495	05/10/2005	Andrew C. Lewin	124-1118	4506
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 01/27/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	PUNNOOSE, ROY M		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22205		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2886	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/534,495	LEWIN ET AL. Art Unit 2886 Ny pending to Applic	
Examiner-induced interview Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROY PUNNOOSE	2886	
All Participants:	Status of Application: Reg Response.	oly pending to Ap	plicant's
(1) <u>ROY PUNNOOSE</u> .	(3) Atty. Stanley C. Spoo	<u>ner (Reg.No. 27,</u>	<u>393)</u> .
(2) <u>SPE Tarifur Chowdhury</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 12 January 2009	Time: <u>10:00 AM</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: Prior art Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863) over claim 1			
Claims discussed: Claim 1			
Prior art documents discussed: Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863)			
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
/ROY M. PUNNOOSE/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2886 (A	.pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On Thursday, 08 January 2009 the Examiner indicated to SPE T. Chowdhury that prior art Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863) read on several claims of the instant application, primarily claim 1. In the interest of expediency SPE Chowdhury telephoned Atty. Spooner to discuss the Examiner's finding. Atty. Spooner stated that he will call back on Monday, 12 January 2009 after discussing the matter with the inventors.

In the interview on Monday, 12 January 2009, Atty. Spooner argued that claim 1 has allowable subject matter because prior art Tiao et al (U.S Patent 6,318,863) does not teach the following:

- 1.A "structured light generator" for illuminating a scene (as in the preamble of claim 1);
- 2. The "projection optics arranged together with said light source and said light guide" so as to project an array of distinct images of the light source towards the scene; and,
- 3. A "projection lens" for projecting light to a scene (compared to prior art using a condenser lens for projecting light to a scene).

In response to Atty. Spooner's arguments, the Examiner and SPE Chowdhury contended that the prior art uses the principles of kaleidoscope which is the same principle that is used in applicant's claimed invention. The Examiner and SPE Chowdhury further contended that all the elements, the light source, the light guide and the projection lens as claimed in claim 1 of the instant application are clearly taught by prior art Tiao et al, specifically in col.10, line 65 - col.11, line 15, and Figure 11.

No agreement was reached. At the conclusion of the interview SPE Chowdhury indicated to Atty. Spooner that the Office's position will be conveyed to the applicant via an office action.